



6.9.1.2



Marykay Voytilla

03/28/2001 04:24 PM

To: bhudson@nidlink.com, brooksa@tgenviron.com, jstefano@ch2m.com, pyritejr@iea.com, ralston@moscow.com, nzilka@nidlink.com

CC:
Subject: Thoughts About Spring Monitoring Program

Hi all,

A few days ago I forwarded to you a March 14, 2001 memo prepared by CH2M Hill regarding 2001 Bunker Hill mine water monitoring. I mentioned that I would set up a conference call for us to discuss the memo, but that I would first review the RI/FS project budget to identify the extent of funding for implementing an in-mine monitoring program this Spring. Folks, I'm sorry if I got your expectations up too high, and perhaps I should have looked at the budget before I sent out the memo, but I don't have the excess funds to undertake an in-mine water sampling program under the current RI/FS budget.

Jim and I went through the RI/FS budget and remaining tasks today. Our outstanding work under the RI/FS work assignment includes: finalizing and printing the RI/FS report; draft and final biological assessment; draft and final CTP compliance document (the "NPDES permit equivalent" document that Hill is preparing to identify how we will meet the TMDLs, the expected effluent quality and characteristics, and the associated water quality monitoring activities that will be undertaken); assistance in preparation of a proposed plan and record of decision; attendance at public meetings and preparation of presentation materials for such meetings; and preparation of a responsiveness summary. After funding these activities at the level of effort that we currently estimate will be needed, were projecting a possible excess of funds of about \$30 - \$40,000. I'm not comfortable committing \$34,000 to the monitoring program now and possibly being short of funds later. Especially, given the extreme tightness of funds at EPA for this type of work (i.e., our region alone is short \$800,000 for RI/FS work for this fiscal year, has had to cut certain projects and postpone others, and is indicating that next year will be no different).

On the positive side, I am willing to go ahead and okay the surface stream monitoring efforts as outlined in table 1 of Hill's March memo, and okay the continued reporting, interpretation and manipulation of piezometer data (also identified in table 1). Hill's estimate for this work is about \$12,000. Do you all want to discuss this further on a conference call, or should we just go ahead with planning for the surface stream monitoring? Nick, would DEQ, Terragraphics, or Dale be participating in the surface stream monitoring effort?

Mary Kay

BILL HUDSON / ANDREA BROOKS
MKV / JIM STEFANOFF
JOHN RILEY
DALE RALSTON

4 - 12 - 01 CONF. CALL

- Dale talking to INEEL Folks - Field visit in May (Dale could do west Fork survey)
↳ Tracer studies
- Bill talk to Nick about maybe later in year if have \$ could go back in and visit Barney switch. * Will reconsider in the Fall when budget remaining is more certain.
- Surface work important to pursue - says John mentioned 98/99 snow / would be beneficial to see low water SO 9LA to help INEEL
- Piezometers down load Frequency - ? Dale would do in May next.
- Surface recon - Bill did one last week - Guy (ave no snow) at upper cave / snow about @ water dam
 - Flag proposed diversion location
 - Upslope
 - Where ski road crosses (Area x velocity for flow) (Flow relative main stem Milo) (S. Fork - proposed diversion location)
 - Jim's place to save \$ where possible

Jim & Bill will do up to 4 days recon May - mid June. Dale or Hydco will go in